

# St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly

Published by

the Faculty of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, a graduate school  
of Theology for all branches of the Orthodox Church.

Editorial Board

V. REV. ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN  
REV. JOHN MEYENDORFF

PROF. NICHOLAS ARSENIYEV  
REV. WILLIAM SCHNEIRLA

VOLUME III

FALL 1959

NUMBER 4

## CONTENTS

### Articles:

- Transcendence and Immanence of God  
by Nicholas Arseniev ..... 2
- Ascension and Liturgy  
by Rev. Boris Bobrinskoy ..... 11
- The Orthodox Idea of Christian Education  
by Sophie Koulomzin ..... 29

### Notes and Comments

- The Church Is Hierarchal (A. Schmemmann) ..... 36
- Orthodoxy and Mission (A. Schmemmann) ..... 41

### Book Reviews

- Alexander Bogolepov. The Church under Communism (N. Timasheff) .. 43
- Jean Meyendorff. St. Gregory Palamas (S. Verkhovskoy) ..... 44
- Joseph Glazik. Orthodox Mission (J. Meyendorff) ..... 46
- D. J. Geanakoplos. Michael Paleologos (J. Meyendorff) ..... 47
- J. Gill. The Council of Florence (J. Meyendorff) ..... 47

- Archbishop Iakovos at the Seminary ..... 48

### The Seminary

### Notes on Contributors

Editorial and Subscription Offices

537 West 121st Street, New York 27, New York

Tel. MONument 6-0065

LEONARD KIRVIDA, Managing Editor

GEORGE COREY and NICHOLAS SOLAK, Subscription Managers

Copyright 1959 by St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary

Member, The Associated Church Press

Subscription Rates:

Yearly Subscription: \$3.00    Two Years \$5.00    Single Copy 80¢

# *Transcendence and Immanence of God*

*by Nicholas Arseniev*

## I

In our experience of God, in the encounter with God, two aspects are intimately linked and complete one another: the sense of the **nearness** and that of the **remoteness** of the Divine, the immanence and the transcendence of God.

The sense of the Holy, causing fear, trembling and reverence, belongs to the core of religious feeling. There is a mystery, there is majesty that cannot be investigated by us.

An ineffability belongs to the innermost character of the Divine. In every religious notion, in every image of divinity — however gross and distorted it may be — is a shade of mystery. Sometimes this element is but weakly represented; the Godhead is then more or less felt as dissolved in the life of the world or identified therewith. But often the sense of a transcending Majesty strikes the soul with deepest awe, makes it prostrate itself in humble adoration. Without this awe, without this adoring prostration there is no real piety. The element of 'transcendence' is thus to a certain extent present even in immanent or naturalistic aspects of religion. On higher levels it becomes more and more decisive and explicit. 'Take off they shoes from off they feet, for the place whereon thou standest, is holy ground' — so the voice of God addresses Moses from out of the burning bush.

This sense of divine aloofness, the being aware of Something that is unapproachable, overpowering, of Something that awakes awe, that requires adoring devotion and surrender, is characteristic of every deeper religious emotion, especially as we said, on the higher levels of religious life and experience. And this is closely connected with the feeling that the overawing Divinity is at the same time a **Presence**, that can be approached, that can be propitiated, that can show Itself gracious and merciful. So Transcendence and Immanence are closely connected with one another in various forms of religious experience. But often one of these elements predominates in a decisive way; in the naturalistic or pan-



theistic religions, the element of Immanence; in the religious outlook of Platonism, that of Transcendence. In Mystical experience — especially in Christian mystical experience — the highest synthesis is achieved between these simultaneously given aspects: the sense of the nearness and the sense of the transcendence of God.

The Highest is quite near, here. He enters my heart and soul. I become united with Him. And Christ, here among us, a man like ourselves ('we have touched Him with our hands', says John) is the inrush of the Living God, of Life Eternal into the texture of our human, earthly life and history, is Life Eternal. 'And we have seen — His glory', says the apostle and we worship Him thus with Thomas: 'My Lord and my God!'

## II

A striking instance of immanency in religion, where the Transcendent seems to be completely lost sight of, is the religion of Dionysos in Ancient Greece. There is a mighty stir and uprush of life in awakening Nature. The young god coming to his worshippers is identified with the wild exultant stream of renewed life. The mountain-tops awake, men and animals revel in the encounter. Nature is entranced and enchanted. Rock and cliffs spout streams of wine, milk flows from the depths of the earth, honey drops from wild forest-oaks. Meanads and wild beasts of the forests join together in an enraptured dance. And the god suddenly appears among them in the shape of a young bull, or a he-goat, or a young lion, and his raw flesh is torn in pieces and swallowed by his maddened followers. It is the triumph of wild emotions, of savage exuberant life; it is an ecstasy of rioting sap running again through the veins of Nature. There is no transcendency, no moral restraint whatever. The faithful are borne along by this exuberant stream, become part thereof, just little drops, losing their personality, submerged in this torrent of impersonal, elemental, riotous revelry. They are submerged in the Divine, they participate therein, but this Divine is nothing else than the exuberancy of Nature-life, always renascent from death and always succumbing to it anew. For in pure Immanence there is no victory over death. This young god himself, carried along in triumph, succumbs to it again and again. There is no final redemption from the sway of Fate and Evil and Suffering and Death in the purely immanent divinities of Nature.

Alongside the wild Dionysian cult which streamed into Greece in comparatively recent times (seventh or eight century B. C.)

from half-barbarian Thracia, there is the balanced, harmonious Olympian Greek religion, with its beautiful, so human, so nobly shaped gods, in whose company even the turbulent Dionysos became harmonized, a vision of shining youthful beauty and grace. Those divinities of the Olympian pantheon are not — or are no more, if they ever had been — an embodiment of elemental forces of Nature, they are shapes of beauty, they are inspired by an aesthetic conception of life, they reign in a Universe of harmony and beauty. But in the aesthetic character of their Universe lies its weakness.

The aesthetic point of view obscures the moral one. There is harmony and balance, but no final justice in this world. And no salvation from death. Death swallows up all individuals and all that is concrete and personal, human joys and human sorrows, this man and that man, this plant and that plant — only the species remains, only the general outlines, the harmony and the order. And the gods are the guardians thereof. They are 'jealous' of all individual achievements, of all that brings man near to immortality: They keep the immortality for themselves. They are the embodiments of the unshakable laws of the universe, where all that is individual passes, but the laws remain. Their beauty, their shining forms are immanent in the immutable harmony and order of the 'Cosmos' that passes away in all its components, except the immortal gods, but remains in its general outlines, its eternal beauty and life. But it is a life composed of innumerable series of deaths, not victorious over Death, not conquering and destroying it, not really transcendent to it — no real Life Eternal. These gods are immanent in the beauty and harmony of an unsatisfactory 'Cosmos', unsatisfactory despite all its beauty: because dying, decaying, and remaining only in its idea, in its general forms and unshaken order. The stoic on the imperial throne, Marcus Aurelius, having praised the beauty and harmony of the world's order, suddenly exclaims in a fit of deepest despondency: 'How long then?' and six hundred years before, another sage — the great Heraclitus — also, after entranced, enthusiastic words about the order and harmony of universal life, adds in deepest sadness and resignation: 'The most beautiful Universe is comparable to a heap of rubbish scattered about at random.'

On the line of pure immanence there is release from the bonds of individuality, but no final release from the fetters of Death. All that is concrete and individual, all living personality, is vowed to Death.



### III

The transcendent God! An immense truth is revealed here, as we have seen it already. The Seraphim in the vision of Isaiah (ch. vi) cover their faces with their wings and exclaim in fear and trembling: 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord Sebaoth!' The creature does not dare to look up. This sense of overwhelming, crushing Majesty and of immense distance between God and creature pervades the writings of the prophets. There are words, there are prayers or confessions which, to a certain extent, succeed in conveying this sense of immense distance — the utter smallness and nothingness of the creature and the overpowering greatness of God: of God who is Master over life and death, over being and non-being, over all that exists and whatsoever shall come into existence, and is still beyond that, Unreachable, Unfathomable, Unspeakable and — Real, the Only One who is really Real in the ultimate sense of the word.

The transcending majesty of God is strongly conveyed e. g. in the fortieth chapter of Isaiah:

Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended all dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?

Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him?

With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and shewed to him the way of understanding?

Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust on the balance: behold, he taketh up the isles as a very little thing.

And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, nor the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering.

All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity.

To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?...

... Have ye not known? have ye not heard? hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of earth?

It is he who sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in;

That bringeth the princes to nothing; he maketh the judges of the earth as vanity.

Scarcely they have been planted; scarcely they have been sown; scarcely their stem did take root in the earth; and he shall blow upon them, and they shall wither, and the whirlwind shall take them away as stubble.

To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One.

Life up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth (vv. 12-18 and 21-6).

'I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty' — so we read in the Revelation of St. John.

The Divine Darkness, the Primordial Light, that is so bright, that it is felt as darkness by our bedazzled eyes which are too weak to sustain it, the Divine Desert, or Waste, the Unknown Country, the Abyssm of Divine Silence ('in which are engulfed all the true lovers', says Ruysbroeck), the totally Other ('Niti! Niti! — 'Not so! Not so!' — of the Upanishads), the Night of Otherness and total Estrangement, of which John of the Cross explains in rapture:

'Oh! Noche que guiaste.

'Oh! Noch amable mas que l'alborada!...'

('O Night, that hast led me! O Night, that art more lovable than the light of the Dawn!') — these all are but utterly inadequate images, poor stammerings pointing to the overwhelming Majesty of Transcendent Reality and Life. Unapproachable Transcendence, unfathomable depth of profoundest Peace and Quiet which is also utterly dynamic; there is no lifelessness, no passivity, but Creative Energy, Overpowering Might. Burning, cleansing, attracting, opening the eyes of the soul, converting, taking hold of, totally reshaping, changing, making a new creature. The Transcendent God shows His Transcendence, His Otherness, His overpowering, indescribable Majesty in His immanence, in His drawing near, in His speaking to the heart.

#### IV

'Lo! I stand at the door and I knock. And if any man hears My voice and opens to Me I will come to him, and sup with him, and he with Me.' The Overpowering, the Transcendent is near — that is mystical experience. In this mystical experience the Immanence of the Transcendent — as we said already — becomes apparent. The nearer it comes, the greater His incomparable Majesty reveals it-



self to us. And the summit of His power and majesty is revealed just in this His drawing near, in His condescension, in His pouring Himself out in love. This is the real, the ultimate sense of His immanence: His pouring Himself out in love.

The Immanence is also revelation of His unique greatness, of His uniqueness: He sustains us, He encloses us from all sides. All lives only through Him and by Him. His is the working power, His the source of life which permeates all. 'In Him we live and move and exist', says St. Paul, repeating the words of a stoic poet. A rightly understood immanency does not exclude a rightly understood transcendence in the notion of God, rather they presuppose and complete each other. There is no true religious experience, where one of these two aspects of religion is lacking. We can see it in the Old Testament, but especially in the Christian revelation. In chapter forty of Isaiah, already quoted, where the incomparable power and transcending majesty of God were depicted, we see both aspects stressed with equal strength:

Behold, the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him.

He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young...

... Why sayest thou, o Jacob, and speakest, o Israel; my way is hidden from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God?

Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard? that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding.

He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength (vv. 10, 11, 27-9).

And compare in Chapter XLII these two closely connected verses (15-16), of which the first depicts the awe-inspiring, dreadful power of the Lord, whose presence burns and shakes the created world to its foundations, and the next, immediately following verse stresses the condescending meekness and kindness of the same Lord:

I will make waste mountains and hills, and dry up all their herbs; and I will make the rivers islands, and I will dry up the pools...

And I will bring the blind by a way that they know not; I will lead them in paths that they have not known: I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them, and not forsake them.

The Old Testament knows that the Lord surrounds us from all sides; that He speaks to us through the voice of the creation:

Thou has beset me behind and before, and laid thy hand upon me... Whither shall I go from thy spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence?

If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there.

If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost of the sea;

Even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me (Psalm 139, 5, 7-10)

The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handy work (Psalm 19, 1).

There is a beautiful story dating from the seventeenth century. A young novice in Northern France, a very good-hearted, but not very bright boy, who could be used for kitchen-work only, as his intellect was rather undevelopped, stepped once out of his monastery on the high-road. He saw before him a naked tree, deprived already of all its leaves, as it was November. And suddenly the thought presented itself to his mind, that in the spring the tree would be again covered with leaves and blossoms and sap again would stream through its branches, and the idea of the majesty and the omnipotence of God flashed on him with such a force, that he became a totally other man — of great spiritual insight, deeply aware of the all-pervading Presence of God.\*). So God revealed Himself to him through a naked tree. One could quote many similar examples: the majesty of God revealing itself to the soul in the beauty, in the quiet and silence and the intense and silent life of Nature.

God's nearness, God's presence can dawn on us from different quarters, from different events and experiences of our life. We can hear His voice in the warmth and the sanctity of the family hearth, in the tenderness of domestic affections, in happiness and joy, in the blissful atmosphere of family love, but also in sorrowful visitations, in pain and suffering. We feel His presence in the voice of our moral conscience, in the inspiration which incites us to deeds of heroic self-sacrifice. In the beauty of heroic self-abnegation, in the perseverance of long silent hours of courageous suffering born for His sake, His nearness is felt. We feel it especially when we try to alleviate the suffering of our brethren: 'I was hungry and you gave Me to eat; I was thirsty, and you gave Me to drink;

---

\*) Entretiens avec le Frere Laurent de la Resurrection



I was naked, and you clothed Me; I was homeless, and you took Me in your house; I was sick and in prison, and you came to Me...' 'Because you did it to one of the least of these My brethren, you have done it unto Me.' He is the living background on which these our brethren stand and live. When they suffer, His mystical presence in them, through them, behind them becomes especially apparent.

Not only those brethren can be deeply touched and moved, when a saving hand is stretched out to them, not only **they** feel then the nearness of the saving and helping Lord in this helping brotherly hand, in this deed of brotherly love which saves them and cheers them up, but in a far greater measure **we**, if we are the helping ones, if this help, this saving deed is being accomplished through us, if we become the channel, so to say, of this saving action towards our brethren, much more we — I say — may receive the great boon, the great grace of feeling His Presence, that suddenly discovers itself to us in the suffering brethren. Not that the brother becomes by himself uninteresting to us, not that his individuality is, so to say, merged into, swallowed up for us by the Presence of the Divine. Just the contrary: this human concrete individuality of the least of our brethren whom we are actively helping, becomes of immense value in our eyes, becomes precious to us: it is enlightened, is illuminated for our spiritual eye by the presence of Christ in this, perhaps the least one, the least interesting and inspiring one, our suffering brother. This is the Christian immanence of Divine Love, this is what makes the person of the least of our brethren so sacred, this is what gives to authentic Christian love a **mystical tone**: the sense of the nearness, of the presence of the Lord. This is one — and perhaps the most telling and convincing one — of the real mystical encounters between God and the Christian soul.

## V.

We said already: the outstanding, striking feature of the mystical experience, of the mystical encounter between God and the soul on its height is the most intimate union of Divine Transcendence with Divine Immanence. Here, present, 'taking hold of me', 'laying His hand on me', more: the Fount of my being, felt by me as such (the 'Root of Life', according to Plotinus), my Lord and my King and my Master, taking abode in me, the Inner Light, illuminating all my being, the Precious Pearl of the soul — and at the same time Unfathomable and Unutterable Majesty, the Transcending Light that

dazzles, the Fire that consumes all that is unclean, that makes the creature kneel down in silent adoration. 'Take off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.!

'Engradeceis vuestra nada!' says St. Teresa of Spain. ('Thou fill'st with grace this Nothing!') 'Feu' ('Fire') — so begins the 'document' of Pascal, written by him in the night of his Conversion. 'O lámparas de fuego' ('Oh, flashes of Fire') exclaims John of the Cross.

The central experience of the Christian mystic (but we find this also in theistic mystical experience outside of Christianity, for instance, in Persia and medieval India) is that the High One, the Supreme One voluntarily and freely condescends, 'stoops down' to come to me, to fill up the chasm between His Majesty and Glory and my Nothingness. And this enhances my feeling of admiring gratitude, my sense of being overwhelmed, being laid hand upon by the boundless Live. 'Who art Thou, O my sweetest God ('o dulcissime Deus meus') and who am I, the little servant and worm before Thy face?' says Francis of Assisi. 'I am not worthy that Thou enterest under the roof of my house' — so speaks the soul in the Eucharistic prayers — in East and West — before the Communion.

The condescending humility and loving-kindness of the Almighty God: that is the keynote of Christian mystical experience and Christian piety. That is also the whole contents, the whole purport of the Christian message, of the witness of the apostles.

## VI

'We have seen... His Glory'. 'We have touched with our hands' — and That was 'the Life Eternal'. Immanence and Transcendence given simultaneously: this is based on a fact, and this fact is: the Word among us, manifested in Flesh, having become Flesh. Most intimate fusion, or rather synthesis of Transcendence and Immanence, but not only in our interior experiences, and emotions, but in a fact, in that which has really taken place. 'We have heard and seen and touched it with our hands... and we bear witness thereof,' and that was 'the Life Eternal.' The salvation of the world lies in the fact, that Transcendent God became Man, became near to me and like me, and that we are now 'grafted' on Him.

Not only He condescended, but now our poor Humanity is grafted on His Divinity, in order that it should share in His Transcendence and Glory.





# *Ascension and Liturgy*

## The Ascension and High Priesthood of Christ in relation to Worship.

*Rev. Boris Bobrinskoy*

Before studying the mystery of Christ's Ascension and of his heavenly Priesthood, as projected in the liturgy, we will devote an introductory section to their setting in the New Testament and in the tradition of the early Church. We will then show how the liturgical service is a sacramental participation in these mysteries.

\* \* \*

### I. In the New Testament and the tradition of the early Church

A real analysis of the facts described in the New Testament would lead us too far from our subject and beyond our competence. But one thing must be pointed out: the Church made a clear choice between the various narratives and descriptions of Christ's Ascension which were known in the middle of the second century, and it firmly excluded from the Canon the apocryphal stories which described so naively and so boldly the actual way in which Christ ascended into heaven, to the amazement of the angelic hierarchies. Amid the extremely divergent descriptions of the Ascension, and through the multiplicity of detail, the Church has only retained in the Bible the **terrestrial** and the **transcendent** aspects of the mystery of the Ascension. The terrestrial aspect is given through the statement of the apostles who were eye-witnesses of the Ascension, humbly relating their tangible experience of Christ's disappearance and their return to Jerusalem "in great joy" (Luke 24:52). It is the paradoxal joy of separation, a real joy due to the certainty of the coming of "the other Comforter" promised to them by Jesus (Luke 24:49; John 17:7), and through whom he will himself be present in the world. The transcendent aspect of the mystery, which is the only aspect important for faith, is "the ascension of the Risen Christ to the divine world of glory. Christ's invisible, transcendent accession to the divine world is clearly the essential part of the

mystery. His visible departure from this world is only a secondary aspect of it. This explains why early Christian tradition laid so much stress upon the essential affirmation of Christ's triumph in heaven"¹).

The description of the Ascension is found in many sources in the tradition of the early Church, both in the Apocryphal writings (the Ascension of Isaiah, the Epistles of the Apostles, the Apocalypse of Peter) and on the writings of the Fathers and teachers of the Church (Justin, Hermas, Irenaeus, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Ambrose, John of Damascus, Gregory Palamas).

Usually the Fathers reproduce not only the narrative of the Evangelists, but also the facts of the Apocryphal writings relating to Christ's Ascension into heaven, at the stupefaction and admiration of the angelic powers in face of the triumph of the Saviour physically entering heaven, and sitting in our human form upon the very throne of God. That is the main theme of the Festival of the Ascension, which is the liturgical expression of this same primitive tradition. The essential truth taught us here by the Church is that Christ's Ascension is not only an event in His earthly life, but a drama played out in the sphere of the spiritual creation, and that it is in the spiritual sphere that it receives its true cosmic proportion.

In the progressive elaboration of the theme of the Ascension, certain messianic Psalms have played an outstanding part. For instance Psalm 24:7-10 (a dialogue between the angels and their stupefaction when Christ glorified enters into heaven; this theme is not found in the New Testament, but apocryphal writings and the Fathers of the Church frequently apply it to the mystery of the Ascension); Psalm 68:18 (exaltation of the Messiah who has ascended on high and liberated the captives; this Psalm is quoted in connection with the Ascension in Ephesians 4:7-9); and finally Psalm 110, 1-4 (where the Messiah-King is seated at the right hand of God and is victorious over his enemies; I. Cor. 15:25-26; Rom. 8:34, and Hebrews 10:12-13; in the Symbol of Nicaea-Constantinople, and in the writings of the Early Fathers).

Although the Ascension of Christ and His session on the right hand of the Father are attested by the writers of the New Testament, and in the early Church, the festival of the Ascension does not appear as such until the 4th century — first in the Church at Jerusalem which desired to recall the mysteries of our redemption at



the place and on the actual anniversary of the day when they occurred. The celebration of the Ascension very soon spread to all the Churches within Christendom. From the 4th century onwards, therefore, we find sermons preached on Ascension Day (Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom). Probably the pre-Nicaean Church celebrated the Ascension at Pentecost; and the whole of Eastertide (50 days) was probably devoted to the common and indivisible celebration of the glorious mysteries of Christ, without special emphasis on the Ascension, but in general meditation upon the exaltation of our Saviour in the Resurrection and Ascension.

\* \* \*

## II. The heavenly dimension of Redemption in the Epistle to the Hebrews<sup>2</sup>)

1. More than any other book of the New Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews, together with the book of Revelation, reveals the heavenly aspect of the Sacrifice of the Lamb. It shows the Messiah's work of redemption to be essentially sacrificial. Through the Son's voluntary self-sacrifice, mankind is reconciled with the Father who accepts the oblation. Saint Paul expresses this idea in a passage which is of direct concern for the Ascension: "Christ being come a high priest of good things to come... by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us" (Heb. 9:11; cf. 4:14; 8:1; 9:24; 10:12-23; 12:2.). The holy of holies, the heavenly sanctuary, is the glorious Presence of the Father, of which the Temple at Jerusalem was the figure, the altars within our churches Sacramental representation of that holy sacrifice<sup>3</sup>). The priesthood exercised by Jesus during his earthly life is eternal; it is carried out in the heavenly sanctuary. It is in heaven that the sacrifice of the cross is accepted, before the hidden altar of God's glory. Since his ascension Jesus has been enthroned at the right hand of God. He has penetrated into the heavenly sanctuary, and God's promise has been fulfilled, "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec". The eternal priesthood in accordance with the order of Melchisedec is carried on in the presence of the Father. "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us," (Heb. 9:24), and from there he intercedes as a Mediator for mankind, and dispenses the good things to come (Heb. 9:11).

2. It is from the two-fold perspective — both earthly and heavenly — of the mystery of our redemption, as described in Hebrews, that we are able to understand the work of the risen Christ in connection with his sacrifice. The suffering and glory of Christ at Easter, his resurrection from the dead, his ascension into heaven and his enthronement at the right hand of the Father have been accomplished in history, in “the last days” once for ever so that they have a universal range and a cosmic scope. But we must not lose sight of the heavenly, supra-historic dimension of the mystery of our salvation which includes and gathers together the “time” of divine foreknowledge (I. Peter 1:20; Rev. 13:8; 17:8), the time of the preparation and of the prophetic visions, the time of realization in history under Augustus and Tiberius, the time of the Church between the Ascension and the Parousia, and finally the time of universal Judgment when “there shall be time no longer... when the mystery of God shall be finished” (Rev. 10:6-7). We have no right to introduce our linear conception of time into the heavenly vision of the mystery. The nature of the heavenly view of reality is concealed from us, but it is revealed to us through the liturgical experience of the Church. Every prophetic vision of the mystery of the redemption tends to superpose and merge the periods which we separate in their historical development<sup>4</sup>).

The heavenly priesthood of Christ constitutes the very heart of the mystery; it is the heavenly, extra-temporal representation of the redemption in history. The two planes (historical and celestial) are inseparable, but a distinction must be drawn between them. It was on earth that the Son of God fulfilled his sacrifice; but it is in heaven that his sacrifice is accepted, for the final end of the paschal drama is our Father who is heaven. It is in this heavenly perspective that the whole of Christ's ministry on earth must be contemplated.

“Jesus was slain on Golgotha, but it was beneath the Tabernacle of heaven that he offered his Blood as our Priest. The offering presupposes the sacrifice. The doctrine in Hebrews does not abandon Golgotha; but the priestly ministry of Christ (which is emphasised through this sacrifice) is related not to Golgotha but to the Tabernacle of heaven. The two factors are closely linked. But the death of Jesus on the Cross was accomplished at a definite time and place; Golgotha is part of history. The heavenly sanctuary is beyond time and space. One can only speak conditionally of the heavenly Tabernacle as the ‘place’ where Christ's sacrifice took place. But the



temporal and the extra-temporal are given in an indivisible unity in the Epistle to the Hebrews.”<sup>5)</sup>

Christ's sacrifice is therefore accomplished once for all, it is perfect and complete and has been accepted by the Father; Pentecost is the undoubted sign of this. But Christ's death takes all its meaning from the perspective of the holy sacrifice for ever offered by Christ. His priestly intercession for sinners remains for always.<sup>6)</sup>

But the theme of Christ's **heavenly priesthood** (contained in Hebrews) by no means covers the whole of Christ's eternal mediation for men. The Epistle to the Hebrews uses the word “forerunner” to describe the heavenly High Priest: “Within the veil... the forerunner is for us entered even Jesus, made a high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.” (Heb. 6:20). This passage expresses a truth which is of the utmost importance for an understanding of Christian worship, namely that it was not only in his capacity as High Priest, but also as “forerunner for us” that Jesus entered heaven<sup>7)</sup>. By penetrating within the Holy of Holies, he draws us after him into the intimacy of the life of the Trinity, which had hitherto been inaccessible to fallen mankind, into the very heart of the divine Glory, of which the biblical image was the Holy of Holies in the temple at Jerusalem. A solemn procession is formed, and a whole cloud of witnesses rises up to follow Christ glorified (cf. also Heb. 12:12-14; 13:14; I Thes. 4:17).

“The Son and the sons walk together, as associates in the same enterprise (“partakers of Christ”, Heb. 3:14) like a Shepherd and his sheep (Heb. 13:20). They form a single group as they march forward. The High Priest's entry into God's presence must therefore be regarded as the entry of a forerunner (Heb. 6:20). He traces the path, he goes ahead to inaugurate and consecrate it (Heb. 10:19-20). The believers have only to follow him in order to enter heaven themselves also...”<sup>8)</sup>.

The place set aside for the formation of this procession is the Church, the House of God, whose head is the High Priest himself (Heb. 10:21 ff). It is centered in the eucharistic liturgy of the community, which is one with the heavenly offering of Jesus. The eucharist is a liturgical projection of the heavenly worship presented by Jesus, the High Priest; it is also the commemoration of Christ's sacrifice in history on the Cross.

### III. The Ascension in eucharistic worship

The eucharistic liturgy is the common act of the Church through which it expresses its priestly vocation. In fact the Church participates in the priestly mission of her divine Bridegroom (cf. Exod. 18:6; I Pet. 2:5, 9; Rev. 5:10). In the eucharistic service the whole Church is associated with the sacrifice of Christ. Through the intermediary of the consecrated minister, the Church is the High Priest of the new faith, and intercedes for mankind in **Christo** before the throne of God. The worship of the Church therefore constitutes a liturgical and sacramental representation of the sacrifice on the Cross and of the heavenly priesthood of Jesus, in which the two aspects of his ministry (earthly and heavenly) are commemorated and portrayed. Bishop Cassien writes: "The same correlation which exists between Christ's death on Golgotha and his sacrifice under the Tabernacle beyond time and space — that same correlation must be affirmed between the heavenly sacrifice and the many celebrations of the eucharist on earthly altars"<sup>9</sup>)

The earthly aspect (the sacrifice of the Cross and the Resurrection) is commemorated in the memorial of the Passion, in the minister's recital of Christ's last commandment ("do this in remembrance of me"), and in the repetition of the words pronounced by Christ when he instituted the Last Supper.

The heavenly aspect of Christ's sacrifice (his self-offering and his intercession before the throne of God) is no longer commemorated because, as we have seen, it transcends time and space. Not being situated in the past, it can only be the object of an invocation, an "**epiclesis**" addressed to the Father in heaven, in which the Church joins in the priestly intercession of Christ, praying God to bestow the Holy Spirit upon the gifts offered upon the altar, and upon the faithful who surround the minister. The epiclesis, the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and the expectation of his coming, correspond in the history of the Church to the ten days between Ascension and Pentecost when the Apostles met in the temple (Luke 24:53) and in the upper room (Acts 1:13) and there awaited in joy the coming of the Comforter promised to them by Jesus.

These two aspects — commemoration and epiclesis — are indeed indivisible, but a distinction must be drawn between them, because it is the gift of the Holy Spirit which is the pledge that the Father has accepted the eucharistic offerings; and it is through the descent of the Holy Spirit that the unity of the Shepherd's flock



is strengthened. Fortified with the Pentecostal gifts, the flock moves forward towards the heavenly sanctuary, in the steps of the Forerunner.

The heavenly dimension of the Orthodox liturgy springs from the very nature of the Church. The Church in its intimate nature is not merely an expectation of the Kingdom of God; it is a foreshadowing of that Kingdom already in existence now, in earth. By its very nature the Church is placed between the two "aeons" — the old aeon of sin, under the domination of the powers of evil, in which we are still waiting and striving for the final victory of God — and the new aeon when God's Kingdom shall be consummated. Nevertheless it is undeniable that His Kingdom is already present in the life of the Church on earth.

"The Church in the world writes Olivier Clement, is not merely a proclamation of God's Kingdom, but a realisation of it; nevertheless it is not of this world... The time of the Church therefore culminates in the realisation by every human being that the End is already present, and that history is already consummated in Christ."<sup>10</sup>)

The whole prayer of the Church is therefore an invocation of the Kingdom of God, a triumphant certainty that it is near, that it is within us, a call and an expectation of Pentecost when, in response to Jesus' supplication (John 14:16) the Father pours out the living waters of the Holy Spirit upon the Church. It is in the Church's prayer that this present, radiant reality of the Kingdom becomes eminently tangible.

„The whole of the Church's charismatic life, says Fr. S. Bulgakov with its prayers, offices, sacraments, in which the grace of the Holy Spirit is always poured forth, belongs to the sphere of God's Kingdom. As members of the Church we penterate into that Kingdom and participate in it..."<sup>11</sup>)

This celestial dimension is expressed with remarkable constancy throughout the Orthodox liturgy. The Fathers of the Church insisted upon this<sup>12</sup>). The liturgy re-creates for us the earthly life of the Word Incarnate and his ascension in glory. It is not restricted, like the Latin mass, to the accomplishment of the non-bloody Sacrifice, pervaded by appropriate readings and prayers.<sup>13</sup>)

In a classical work entitled *l'Explication de la divine Liturgie* Nicolas Cabasilas, a great lay mystic of the 14th century in Byzantium, describes the symbolic meaning of the different eucharistic rites and prayers as follows: "The psalmodies at the beginning (of

the liturgy of the catechumens) indicate the first period of the redemptive plan; the biblical readings which follow indicate the second period. What precedes the Sacrifice recalls what happened before the Lord's death: his coming, his perfect manifestation. The Sacrifice commemorates the death of Christ, His Resurrection and His Ascension up to the moment when he transforms the precious gifts into the actual body of the Saviour. The Consecration which follows the act of Sacrifice commemorates the promise of the Father, i. e. the descent of the Spirit upon the Apostles, the conversion of the nations through the Apostles, and the divine Society"<sup>14</sup>).

The liturgy of the „catechumens“, or liturgy of the Word, opens with the Trinitarian benediction: Blessed be the Kingdom of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit...” The whole purpose of Christian worship is to bless the Trinity, and to proclaim aloud the coming of the Kingdom to the ends of the earth.

The liturgy of the catechumens “is a slow but constant movement of souls upward towards heaven,”<sup>15</sup>) culminating in the solemn procession with the Gospel and the singing of the Trisagion (“Holy God, Holy and Mighty, Holy and Immortal, have mercy upon us”). As Cabasilas, “this is the acclamation of the united choir composed of angels and human beings, welded into a single Church through the manifestation of Christ who is both of heaven and of earth. That is why we sing this hymn after the ostension and entry (procession) of the Gospel, thus proclaiming that by coming among us Christ has placed us with the angels, and established us amid the angelic choirs”<sup>16</sup>). The **Trisagion** is a Christian form of the chant “Holy, Holy” sung by the cherubim in Isaiah’s vision (Isaiah 6:3) and by the four beasts in the Book of Revelation (Rev. 4:8)<sup>17</sup>). The liturgy refers many times to the singing of the **Sanctus**, which stresses the direct participation of the angels in the mystery of the Eucharist, and the unity of the Church militant and triumphant centered in Christ glorified (represented on the altar). The angels surrounding the divine throne and continually praising God are invisibly present at the Church’s liturgy, with all the members of the Church in heaven, gathered around the Lamb.<sup>18</sup>). That is why, during the prothesis (the preparation of the eucharistic elements) the officiating priest speaks not only of the living and the dead, but also of the members of the Church Triumphant, of the Virgin Mary, the saints and angels, thus commemorating the participation of the whole Church in the heavenly sacrifice symbolised upon the altar.



As the solemn moment of the mysteries approaches, the priest invokes God's mercy and implores him to make us worthy to stand before his holy altar without reproach or condemnation, for the altar before which the priest stands is the seat of God's glory, though he is invisible to our bodily eyes.

The "Liturgy of the Faithful" or Eucharist opens with the **Grand Entry**, a slow procession down the nave towards the sanctuary, in the priest carries aloft the unconsecrated elements above his head. The chants sung at this moment are splendid and are excellent illustrations of our subject. The best-known is the one called the Cherubic Hymn:

"Let us, mystically representing the Cherubim, sing the thrice Holy Hymn in honour of the Life-giving Trinity; let us lay aside all earthly cares, that we may receive the King of all things, invisibly escorted by the Angelic Hosts. Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia."

On Holy Saturday this hymn is replaced by a hymn drawn from the Liturgy of Saint James:

"Let all mortal flesh keep silence and in awe and trembling stand, laying aside all earthly thoughts; for the King of Kings and Lord of Lords cometh to be slain, and to give himself to be the food of the faithful. Before him come the archangels with the principalities and powers, the many-eyed Cherubim, and the six-winged Seraphim, veiling their faces, and crying 'Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia'".

Finally, at the time of the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified, at the moment of the Great Entry of the priest with the consecrated elements, the choir intones this hymn:

"Now the powers of heaven with us invisibly do minister. For lo! the King of Glory entereth now. Behold the mystical Sacrifice, all accomplished, is ushered in. Let us with fear and love draw near, that we may become partakers of life everlasting. Alleluia, alleluia, alleluia."

These three hymns, and other secret prayers, mention the common theme of the invisible presence of the angelic powers (mystically represented by the believers) which accompany the King of Glory as he mounts the altar of sacrifice. This theme of the presence of the angels and their participation in the worship of the Christian congregation shows the extent to which the Church is conscious of the indivisibility of the visible liturgy and the heavenly worship and how the whole Church Militant forms part of that heavenly adoration and of the ceaseless hymns sung by the angels and the Church Triumphant in praise of the Lamb. The Kingdom

of the Holy Trinity, the invisible presence of the angelic powers, the heavenly sacrifice, the propitiation before the sanctuary of the Father's glory, the expectation and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Christian congregation in a sacramental Pentecost — these are the spiritual themes of the Orthodox liturgy, which is deeply anchored in the spirit of the New Testament and of the early Church.

After the grand entry and some prayers of intercession, comes the anaphora, opening with the traditional words of the ancient eucharistic liturgies: "Lift up your hearts" (**Sursum corda**), which means "Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth" (Col. 3:2). The faithful give their allegiance and declare that where their treasure is, there their hearts are also (Matt. 6:21), there where Christ is seated on the right hand of the Father<sup>19</sup>). The Church always commemorates the upward movement of the liturgy, through which earth and heaven meet. In the liturgy we participate in the one, eternal liturgy of heaven; and heaven itself stoops towards us and enfolds us, raising up our transfigured humanity to heaven. The whole of temporal time is sanctified and receives the value of eternity.

Father Alexander Schmemmann writes: "While the benediction and thanksgiving are found in nearly all the offices of the Church, the exclamation "Lift up your hearts" belongs only to the Eucharist. The reason is that it is something more than an appeal to believers to fix their thoughts on things above. It reminds the Church that **the Eucharist is fulfilled in heaven**, for "when we were dead in sins, God hath quickened us together with Christ (by grace ye are saved); and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly place in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 2:5-6). This rise of the Church to heaven began with the little entry. Moreover in this case heaven means the Kingdom of Glory which was manifest in Christ. The liturgy is the eschatological sacrament, in the sense that what is accomplished in time, on earth, is a manifestation of what is heavenly and eternal, and enables us to participate in those heavenly things. 'Heaven on earth' is the apparently paradoxical formula in which the Eastern Church has from the earliest times expressed this reality manifest in the liturgy as the sacrament of the age to come, the heavenly kingdom revealed on earth. Christ has entered into heaven itself (Heb. 9:24), and our priestly acts will therefore always be the work of Christ 'in heaven, although they are accomplished on earth' (St. John Chrysostom)".<sup>20</sup>



With regard to the anaphora, I will mention the **Sanctus**, which is an integral part of the eucharistic prayer. It is the full expression of the song of triumph and praise sung by angels and men, the inhabitants of heaven and of earth. This song had already been sung before the Gospel-reading (Trisagion) and it was mentioned in the Hymn of the Cherubim accompanying the Great Entry ("Let us sing the thrice Holy Hymn").

During the singing of the **Sanctus** the priest says:

"And we also, O Lord who lovest mankind, in company with these blessed Powers do cry aloud and say: Holy art thou, and all-holy thou, and thine only-begotten Son, and thy Holy Spirit; holy and all-holy; and majestic is thy glory, thou who hast so loved thy world that thou gavest thine only-begotten Son." (John 3:16).

Then follows the memorial of the work of Christ, and the account of the Passion. After the Words of Institution come the Epi-  
clesis — the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the faithful and upon the gifts placed on the altar. A true Pentecost is accomplished at this moment when the Holy Spirit descends not only upon the gifts, consecrating them as the life-giving Body and Blood of Our Lord, but also upon the whole congregation. Sufficient attention is not paid to the fundamental importance of this descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Church during the liturgy, to this invocation repeated several times by the priest between the consecration and the communion, that the Spirit may descend upon the people:

"Judge us worthy to find grace in thy sight, that our sacrifice may be accepted by thee and that the Spirit of thy grace may rest upon us, upon the gifts which we offer to thee, and upon all thy people"

The prayer which follows is particularly remarkable:

"Let us pray the Lord that our God, the love of mankind, having received the Precious Gifts upon his holy, heavenly and spiritual Altar, as a sweet-smelling savour, may in return send down upon us his divine grace and the gift of his Holy Spirit."

In all these prayers of intercession the theme of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the believers recurs. The last prayer especially carries us into the spiritual atmosphere of the Epistle to the Hebrews, within the setting of the celestial liturgy accomplished within the sanctuary of God. The gift of the Holy Spirit upon the elements and upon the faithful is the tangible pledge that the offerings of the Church have been accepted upon the celestial altar as "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour"

(Eph. 5:2), and that offering has become part of the sacrificial drama of the Lamb; for the Spirit which now descends upon the gifts offered by the Church is the same Spirit which descended upon the apostles in the upper room as a pledge of the Father's good will and his reconciliation through the sacrifice of his only Son; and it is the same Spirit by whose power the sacrifice of Christ has become an eternal propitiation (Heb. 9:14), by whose power the Father has raised Christ to his right hand, and by whose power we also are raised to follow Jesus the Forerunner.

A word of dismissal follows, and to conclude the eucharist I will quote Nicolas Cabasilas again:

"The sacrifice being ended... and all the rites of the divine service being completed, the priest seems to take leave after his audience with God and gradually to come from those heights through prayers, first within the sanctuary where he cannot be heard by the people, then leaving the sanctuary, standing in the midst of the people so that they can all hear him..."<sup>21</sup>).

These few examples and quotations drawn from the liturgy of the eucharist are sufficient to give a general idea of the heavenly perspective of the whole of Orthodox worship. As a Lenten prayer expresses it, "Standing in the temple of Thy glory, we believe that we stand in heaven..." As Saint Gregory of Palamas says, "Man illumined attains the summits of eternity... and already here on earth everything becomes miraculous. Even without being in heaven, he vies with the celestial powers in perpetual hymns of praise. In his life on earth he is like an angel, and he leads all creatures to God".<sup>22</sup>)

Unfortunately we have to confine ourselves to the liturgy of the eucharist, which is the centre of the prayer of the Church. But a deeper study of the daily Office would abundantly confirm that it is always in the presence of and in Communion with the angels and the whole Church Triumphant that the Christian congregation renders to God the ceaseless adoration which it owes Him.<sup>23</sup>)

#### **IV. The Ascension, the basis of the missionary witness of the Church**

Taken as a whole the prayer of the Church is therefore a continual ascent of man towards intimacy with God, a procession upwards in the steps of Jesus the Forerunner, towards the Father. This ascension culminates in the divinization of human nature, not only in the life beyond but **here and now**. The climax of this divinization is the eucharistic communion in which God Himself becomes our food and transforms us through union with Himself.

But Christ's ascension, in which we participate here on earth



(Eph. 2:4-6; Heb. 12:22-24) has nothing in common with the individualistic ascensions of the privileged *illuminati* in Platonism, the Greek mysteries or the religions of India. They are all achieved through solitary contemplation, they are "a flight from the alone to the Alone",<sup>24)</sup> they are a series of escapes leading farther and farther away; a forgetting and a denial of material things (which are regarded as evil, or as having no existence), a form of disincarnation. Such ascensions are achieved either through asceticism and ecstasy, or through philosophy, or through initiation into secret rites, in a context of endless transmigrations.<sup>25)</sup>

Amid all these conceptions of salvation as escape, the Christian doctrine of the Ascension alone is connected with a divine purpose for the world itself, which "God loved so much..." (John 3:16). The Christian Ascension alone is based on a complete plan for the salvation of the world and on the Presence of Christ Glorified in the Church, that Presence being realised through the Holy Spirit in his different gifts of grace, a mysterious but real Presence perceptible to the purified senses. The Christian Ascension alone precedes the Descent of God's Spirit upon the Church, thus importing a celestial dimension to its liturgical and sacramental life, and conditioning the Church's missionary witness in the world. "He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things", says Saint Paul (Eph. 4:10) that he may fill all things **through his life-giving Presence, in the Holy Spirit.**

Father Daniélou writes, "It is only through His ascension above the heavens that Christ can fill all things. It is only through being raised above the whole creation that His grace can be poured out upon the whole creation".<sup>26)</sup>

For the Ascension of Christ, and our liturgical and sacramental ascension inaugurated through the mystery of divine worship, is not a means of escape from this world. On the contrary, it is only by lifting up our hearts, by participating in the procession in the steps of the Great Priest and Forerunner, and by penetrating into the vision of intimacy with God, that we can bear authentic witness of "that which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; for the Life was manifested..." (I John 1:1-2).

"The appeal (to lift up our hearts) is therefore not so much an appeal to detach ourselves from the world, but rather to remem-

ber the nature of the Church and the purpose of the eucharistic gathering: "What has heaven to do with me?" said Saint John Chrysostom, "when I am contemplating the Lord of heaven, and becoming heaven myself?" As Jesus promised, "If a man love me... my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him" (John 14:23). This appeal is also a demand. For those who remain on earth ("Let us be afraid of remaining on earth" says Chrysostom again) there is no place in this celestial Eucharist, and then our very presence is imputed to us as condemnation. When the choir, as the mouth-piece of the whole congregation, replies, "We lift up our hearts unto the Lord", our judgment is accomplished. For we cannot turn our hearts to the Lord at that moment unless our hearts are fixed on Him throughout our lives, and unless we always measure earthly things by the standards of heaven..."<sup>27</sup>).

Missionary witness is based on personal experience of the life of the Church. And that experience depends on the vision, the encounter with Christ, who while present in our midst does not cease at the same time to be seated at the right hand of the Father. The biblical themes of the Ascension and of Christ's celestial priesthood constitute in the first place a theological category which is an essential part of the liturgical life of the Church. They form the basis of an Orthodox theology of evangelism of the pastoral ministry, and of the whole mediation of the Church in the world as a royal priesthood. There is an inner link between the two dimensions — liturgical and missionary. They reflect the nature of the Church itself which has two aspects: 1) its life of prayer through which it reaches out towards encounter with Christ glorified in an irresistible impulse of worship; 2) its task of permeating earth with heaven, and raising everyone to their eternal destiny. If the Church's life of prayer is not enclosed, but aims to spread throughout the world, the Church's mission can be none other than to raise up all men to worship the Holy Trinity.

## NOTES

1) P. Benoit. *L'Ascension*. *Revue Biblique* 5 (1949) p. 195. It is scarcely necessary to insist on the fact that according to the testimony of the evangelists Christ's Ascension to the Right Hand of the Father has things to teach us: a) that which concerns His elevation into the Glory of the Father. The



right hand of the Father must not be thought of as meaning a particular place or location but rather in the sense of the glory and honour which the Incarnate Word had before the creation of the world, and which returns to him once more. Christ's exaltation is a qualificative concept and demonstrates the distinction and the substantial distance between the Creator and the creature, the eternal and the temporal: it implies no less the unbreakable link — the bridge (**pontifex**) between these two opposite concepts. Christ united with glorified human nature is raised to the bosom of the Father. This mystery, incomprehensible to natural reason, is the basis of the dogma of the Ascension. b) The second teaching of the New Testament is **that which concerns the presence of Christ in the world**. (Matth. 28:20). This presence is made effective by the action of the Holy Spirit who witnesses to Christ, who is the Spirit of Christ, who perpetuates Christ in the Church by means of the sacramental life, who incorporates us into Christ. This double presence of Christ at the Right Hand of the Father and in the world does not imply a contradiction: rather does it resolve it into an "antinomy", for Christ's presence in the Holy Spirit is nothing than our elevation following upon his into the glory and the intimacy of the Father.

Father Serge Boulgakoff has brought out very clearly this double aspect — terrestrial and celestial — of the Ascension and High Priesthood of Christ in **l'Agneau Divin** (a chapter on the Priesthood of Christ and the Ascension in "Du Verbe Incarné", French translation: Paris, Aubier 1943).

2) A question which it is legitimate to ask here is whether the conception of sacrifice which the Epistle to the Hebrews develops fully corresponds to the redemptive work accomplished by Christ: in other words, whether the sacrificial terminology of the Epistle to the Hebrews has not been applied in too systematic and arbitrary a manner to the eucharistic liturgy in early tradition. In this age-long controversy between reformed and "catholic" theologians on the problem of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist I would particularly like to mention from the Protestant side the recent book by Max Thurian, **L'Eucharistie** (Neuchatel & Paris 1959, 278 p.) The author is here attempting to give value once more to the idea of liturgical sacrifice. Father Spicq has abundantly demonstrated the New Testament affinities of the Epistle to the Hebrews: cf. **L'origine johannique de la conception du Christ-petre dans l'epitre aux Hebreux** in **Aux Sources de la tradition chretienne** (Melanges M. Goguel), Neuchatel et Paris, 1959, pp. 258-269; **L'Epitre aux Hebreux, I. Introduction**, Paris, 1952, pp. 109-168. Cf. Congar **Le Mystere du Temple**, Paris, Cerf, 1958, p. 170.

3) Father Congar has devoted his book **Le Mystere du Temple** to the study of the Presence of God in the Old and New Testament. He shows authoritatively how the Temple and the sacrifices of the Old Covenant are replaced by the very Person of Christ, whose Body is the True Sanctuary of God and how this presence is continued in the Church as the Temple of God and in the Christian as the Temple of the Holy Spirit and finally how this presence is realized in the terrestrial dimension and also eschatologically in heaven in the last days.

4) See the prophecies of the Old Testament, the words of Jesus concern-

ing the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, and also the apocalyptic visions of St. John which we are incapable of transposing literally in the historical framework of our present life.

5) Mgr. Cassien, **Christ and the first christian generation**, Paris, 1950, p. 270 (in Russian).

6) Calvin has clearly shown the celestial element in the Redemption: "Everything which seems at first sight to be earthly in Christ must be considered spiritually, with the eyes of faith. His flesh, which he took from the seed of Abraham, will then be seen to have come to life because it was the temple of God. Even his death brought life to all men, which is certainly a supernatural thing. Thus the Apostle does not merely regard the quality of his human nature, is nothing earthly about the death of Christ... The shedding of his blood was eternal; but the purgation (of sins) was internal and spiritual. In short, he died on earth, but the virtue and effectiveness of his death came from heaven" (on Hebrews 8:2-4). (Quoted by Spisq, *op. cit.* p. 315, note I).

7) Cf. Mgr. Cassien **Jesus le Precurseur** in **Theologia**, 27 (1956), Athenes. Cf. aussi le P. Congar, *op. cit.* pp. 205-207.

8) Spicq, **L'Épître aux Hébreux**, Vol. 1, Introd. p. 301.

9) Mgr. Cassien, *op. cit.* p. 272.

10) Olivier Clement, **Notes sur le Temps** (3rd part). *Messenger de l'Exarchat du Patriarche russe en Europe Occidentale*, No. 28, 1957, p. 217.

11) S. Boulgakoff, **On the Kingdom of God in La Voie**, No. 11, Paris 1928, p. 10 (in Russian). A just balance (!) must be kept between an excessive insistence on the heavenly and eschatological character of the Kingdom already brought about, and an insistence on the other hand on the "not yet" of the Kingdom of God here on earth. The royal priesthood of the Church shows not only the reign of Christ over the Church and his intercession for it, but also the real participation **from now onwards** of the Church in the royal and priestly intercession of the Christ-Forerunner. We are reminded in this connection of both the narrative and the invocatory sense of the Hebrew words "Maranatha" ("Come, Lord" and „The Lord comes") and „Amen" ("It is so" and "So be it").

Here I would point out an introductory lecture by Prof. J. J. von Allmen, **Le Saint Esprit et le Culte**, in **Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie**, Lausanne, 1958, in which the author describes the "jeu eschatologique" ("eschatological play") which is Christian worship, "in the tension between the future which has already begun, with its glory, its freedom and its illumination, and the past which still endures — dark, enslaved and restricted". (p. 16).

12) "According to the traditional conception of the liturgy", writes Mme. M. Lot-Borodine, "this solemn office is only the earthly translation of the office celebrated in heaven by the angelic powers, led by the high priest after the



order of Melchisedec, hence the name *theia* (divine) *liturgia*". M. Lot-Borodine, *Un maître de la spiritualité byzantine au XIVe siècle*. Nicolas Cabasilas. Paris, 1959, p. 23.

13) L. Bouyer, *Les catholiques occidentaux et la liturgie byzantine*, in *Dieu Vivant*, no. 21, p. 22.

14) Nicolas Cabasilas, *Explication de la divine Liturgie*, chap. 16, summary of the meaning of the Liturgy. Migne, P. G. 150, col. 404 B. However, Father Alexandre Schmemmann has clearly demonstrated in a still unpublished essay how the "representative" symbolism of Byzantine commentators on the liturgy showing the meanings of the various parts of the liturgy in relation to redemption must be distinguished from the "synthetic" symbolism of the early Church which made real in the eucharistic sacrifice the complete and indivisible mystery of Christ's death and resurrection.

15) M. Lot-Borodine, *op. cit.* p. 33.

16) Nicolas Cabasilas, *op. cit.* P. G. 150, 412 B — 413 A.

17) According to Byzantine tradition, the *Trisagion* hymn ("Holy God, holy and mighty, holy and immortal") was revealed to the Christians in Constantinople in the fifth century by angels. The Christians are said to have added the words "Have mercy upon us". (St. John of Damascus, *De fide orth.* I. III, chap. X, P. G. 94, 1021 A).

18) "Lamb" — symbolic name given to the consecrated Bread, recalling the sacrifice on the Cross (John 1:29-36) and the celestial adoration of Jesus glorified in the vision of the book of Revelation (Rev. 5:8-14).

19) Nicolas Cabasilas, *op. cit.* P. G. 150, 424 D.

20) Alexandre Schmemmann, *The Liturgy*, in "Le Messager de l'Action chrétienne des Etudiants russes", March-April 1952, p. 16 in Russian).

21) Nicolas Cabasilas, *op. cit.* P. G. 150, 489 B.

22) St. Georgy Palamas, *Traite a la moniale Xenia sur les passions et la quietude mentale*, Migne P. G. 150, 1081 AB.

23) Here are some examples of the hymns sung at Matins during Lent:  
"With all the heavenly powers we cry, like the cherubim, singing the Trisagion hymn: Holy, holy, holy art Thou, O God, through the intercession of Thy incorporeal spirits, have mercy upon us"

"Echoing the celestial powers, we on earth present a hymn of victory to thee, O Thou who art good: Holy, holy art Thou, O God..

"We mortals venture to offer to Thee the hymn sung by Thy spiritual servants, singing: Holy, holy, holy.."

"O Thou who were contained within the Virgin's womb, without separating Thyself from the Father, grant O Christ, our God, that we may join Thy angels in crying to Thee: Holy, holy, holy, art Thou, O God.."

"Having our hearts in heaven, let us echo the angelic host and prostrate ourselves in feare the Incorruptible One, crying to Him without ceasing

the song of victory: Holy, holy, holy, art Thou, O God..."

24) Plotinus, **Enneads**, VI, tr. 9, c. 9 and 11; tr. 7, 3. 34.

25) Cf. H. de Lubac, **Catholicisme**, Paris 1947, chap. V, Le christianisme et l'histoire, doctrines d'évasion, pp. 107-110.

26) J. Danielou, **op. cit**, p. 166.

27) A. Schmemmann, **op. cit**. p. 16.





# *The Orthodox Idea of Christian Education\**

*Sophie Koulomzin*

We have not “discovered” our responsibility for Christian education and instruction. We have a heritage passed on to us through two thousand years of Church tradition which we must learn to know and appreciate if we want to discover new ways of making eternal Christian values relevant to present day experience.

The teaching ministry of the Church was firmly established from the very beginning. “Go ye and teach” was the Lord’s command to His Apostles and as the early Church grew and developed Christian instruction, Christian teaching was a basic part of its community life and liturgical worship. The whole structure of the early Christian Community was determined by the active exercise of the Christian virtues of love, compassion, fellowship, and a constant training in the knowledge of Christian faith. The Divine Liturgy, which is the core of Church life, contains both the mystical sacramental act of grace and the teaching part which prepared the catechumens for full participation. How effective was this teaching is witnessed by the countless lives of holy martyrs, many of them very young people or even children, who confessed their faith in the face of terrible odds. The same teaching tradition of the Church reflected itself in the period of the great theologians of the IVth century when intricacies of the dogma of the Holy Trinity were discussed in the market places and proclaimed in sailors’ songs. When Christianity became the accepted “everyone’s religion,” when it was easier to be nominally Christian than to be non-Christian, a new type of teaching method was introduced by the desert fathers who through their striking feats and their way of life proclaimed the supreme importance of “living in the presence of God” in a world where Christian and non-Christian values became inextricably confused.

---

\*) Introduction to “Lectures in Orthodox Christian Education” to be published soon by St. Vladimir’s Seminary.

The priest who plans the religious education program in his parish today, the Sunday School teacher who faces her class, continue, by delegation, that very same tradition. They are heirs to 2000 years of experience in Christian education and yet they are challenged by a truly creative task, for every historical period, every stage of human civilization brings with it special needs and the task of the educator is to build a bridge between the eternal truths of Christianity and the cultural and social environment and needs of every particular generation.

As Orthodox Christian educators today, in this country, we are very conscious of our confusion, our uncertainty. Just what should we teach to make the essence of our faith a reality to our children and young people? How should we teach? What is the point of relevance of our religious tradition to the daily life experience of our children? What are the objectives and the limitations of our church school work? How can we improve it? How can we evaluate it? These and many other similar questions should form the object of study and research in our theological schools of today.

\* \* \*

The religious educational situation in the Orthodox Church in this country is influenced by the cultural heritage of the Old World and the religious educational trends and background of this country, i. e., mainly the Protestant religious educational situation.

The situation in the Old World to which we are immediately heirs, i. e., the Nineteenth Century, had greatly changed from the older days when education in general and Christian education were one and the same. In the Middle Ages learning to read meant learning to read the Scriptures, art meant religious art, science, law, politics presupposed a Christian concept of life. The Middle Ages were not a Golden Age of Christian life, but there was a general acceptance of Christian criteria and standards, such as they were understood at that time. The process of secularization, begun with the Renaissance and attaining its full expression with the 19th century, changed all this. Culture, civilization, science, economic life became a world living according to its own laws, Christianity became a thing apart, a set of values, a way of life restricted in a kind of water-tight compartment that did not penetrate into the other realms of life.

Formal Christian education of the 19th century was deeply



affected by this new period of civilization — of post-Christian secularization, if one may term it thus, as opposed to pre-Christian paganism. "Religious instruction" became one of the subject-matters taught in school, to be memorized, a subject for examinations, and grades. Worst of all, it became a subject far less interesting and challenging than literature or physics, less important to one's academic career than Latin or Greek.

Recognition must be given, however, to the work done by the Christian educators of those times. The gradual filtering and boiling down of the essence of knowledge about God, about the Orthodox faith, about the Holy Scriptures and Holy Tradition to a minimum that can be taught, understood, assimilated within a school curriculum represents a great labor. Whatever are the defects of the 19th century text books on religion they have provided us with material without which it would be difficult to discover methods of religious education that seem to answer better the needs of our times.

The lack of religious inspiration in the formal instruction given at school was somewhat compensated by the religious traditions of home life that were particularly strong in the rural populations of the Old World. There was an Orthodox way of life that made itself felt, in which the liturgical calendar and liturgical services permeated the social patterns of home and village life.

What was the religious educational situation in the United States at the time when large numbers of Orthodox people began to settle here and the foundations of Orthodox church life were being laid in the new world? The present day situation of the American Protestant Christian educational system cannot be understood unless we see it in the light of certain characteristics, — outdated now — which motivated many of the present tendencies as a swing into the opposite direction. A very characteristic trait of the early 19th century American Protestant religious educational approach was its very pessimistic concept of childhood. Randolph Crum Miller in his **Education for Christian Living** writes' "In the early days of the Sunday School children had been theologically characterized as sinners who could not hope for redemption until they were old enough to confess faith in Christ." This concept was completely foreign to the tradition of the Orthodoxy with the children's full participation in the sacramental life of the Church.

The second trait was that the 19th century Protestant Sunday School were throughly and practically exclusively Bible centered.

The pupil read, memorized, recited passages from the Bible and this was practically the entire contents of religious instruction.

I mention these two aspects of the early American Protestant Sunday School movement because they were the background against which developed modern Protestant religious education. If religious education in certain Protestant Sunday Schools seems more child-centered than God-centered, and "lifesituation" seem to crowd out divine revelation through the Scriptures, it is, in a sense, a reaction against the attitudes of the preceeding period.

But in the Orthodox concept of Christian education which slowly evolved through many centuries of church experience, many of the fears, repressions, and emotional tensions engendered in the Protestant system had been avoided. Thus, the modern psychological approach to human personality should affect the method of presentation, but not the basic concept of Christian growth. Almost the same was true of Biblical historical criticism which affected so deeply the newer trends of Protestant religious education. In an almost exclusively biblical curriculum its contributions were "greeted with apprehension, concern, or enthusiasm..." (R. C. Miller). The Orthodox tradition has always stressed the spiritual message of the Bible, the doctrinal truth expressed through its narratives and biblical texts became familiar and meaningful within liturgical forms of worship. Orthodox liturgical services were training schools of Biblical knowledge, stressing its devotional meaning. Modern historical criticism was much less relevant to this approach, — was much less to the point...

One of the very important matters in which American Protestant Christian education influenced the Orthodox Churches in the New World was the practice of instruction being given by lay teachers. For reasons of expediency this practice was gradually accepted in a vast majority of Orthodox parishes and actually preceeded any concerted effort to adequately train the teachers.

Another point where the Orthodox Church in the States followed the Protestant pattern was the type of instruction chosen for religious instruction — the **Sunday School**. As a matter of fact, there was no Orthodox precedent for this type of school. In the growing Orthodox parishes in this country there was a strong sense of the need for religious instruction. Sunday School was the established pattern in the American community, and the Orthodox parishes took over this type of instruction without any misgivings.



It seemed to be the best known and natural vehicle of instruction. We shall see in later chapters how the choice of Sunday morning for the children's instruction led Orthodox parishes into grave difficulties.

Both the American Protestant and the Orthodox Sunday Schools at the beginning of the 20th century shared the traditional "contents centered" approach to religious instruction. The aim of instruction was to cover a certain amount of informational material presented in a chronological, or else in a logically systematized order, have it well memorized and at least verbally understood. In many cases (and it is always fair to use as examples cases of the better teacher or school) the pupils did memorize a considerable amount of informational material so thoroughly that they could refer to it through the rest of their life. The teacher had the satisfaction of having "covered" all the assigned ground and of using systematizations and logical developments convenient for the adult mind. In many cases, the personality, the sincerity, the truly Christian loveliness of a teacher penetrated the teaching and did leave a lasting impression on the pupils. However, in listening to the reminiscences of the present day older generation, one does not gather the impression that the subject matter taught under the name of religious instruction left a stimulating and inspiring memory. In the Orthodox Church we are still considerably closer to this "contents centered" teaching than are the Protestant churches which rejected it fairly sweepingly. Many of our Sunday Schools are still using it. Yet the defects of the contents centered curriculum are very grave.

The material presented to the children does not correspond to their stage of development, to their needs and their interests. The criteria is not "What does a child of 8 need to know about God, about the Church, about what it means to be a Christian in order to live as fully as possible the life of an 8-year old Christian child?" but "Has the child memorized the Old Testament stories so that we could go on to the study of the New Testament?" The material is not presented as a spiritual nurture to further the growth of the child's soul, but rather as a supply of information to be memorized and stored away for use at some future date when the individual will reach sufficient maturity to appreciate and understand it. The unfortunate drawback is that the child does learn the material as an 8-year old, old or a ten-year old conception of the Old or the New Testament. The stories were told,

the text-books and prayers were explained and memorized at a childish level and in many cases with the coming of a more mature outlook religious ideas and conceptions are discarded as something childish and unsatisfactory.

The "child centered" curriculum was a natural reaction to the "contents centered" education. It was enthusiastically sponsored by the Protestant Sunday Schools and reflected the newer psychological approach to general education. The child's interests, the problems faced by the child, life situation in the class room should determine the contents of the curriculum. "We learn by living" was the slogan, and Christian instruction was to be an interpretation, an expansion, a deepening of the life experience of the class.

The trouble with this approach is that "life experience" is a curiously free, unpredictable and unclassifiable phenomenon. A child, or a group will "experience life" neither at the place nor at the time, nor in the way in which the Sunday School teacher has planned it. The "planned experience" frequently remains a completely dead and unchallenging situation. "The emphasis on problems often leads to an unguided program in which the students wallow in their own ignorance." (Randolph S. Miller).

In studying many of the modern Protestant curricula, one is amazed at the conscious exclusion of the glorious and stimulating riches of Christian tradition, knowledge and experience. Children will be kept for many weeks studying the childhood environment of Jesus because it is supposedly nearer to their interests. As one listens Sunday after Sunday to the action-less stories about how Jesus ran errands for His Mother, about the way water was carried, floors were swept, school was, — and many of the "stories" are pretty insipid, — one wonders why this material is supposed to be more suitable to the childish level than the brief action — and meaningful, dramatic stories of the Old and New Testaments exposing the very basic beliefs of our faith.

Certainly "life situations" have a tremendous teaching potentiality and every good teacher should be ready to drop the best prepared lesson in order to face the challenge of such a situation when it arises. The trouble is that a curriculum based on "planned life situations" easily falls through because the "planned" situation does not become a "life" situation, and the material assembled around this imaginary situation has little intrinsic value or interest.



But if we feel that a contents centered program is lifeless and a life or — child-centered program easily becomes artificial and pointless, what criteria can we apply to programs in Christian education?

In the paper I presented at the Orthodox Christian Education Conference in the fall of 1956, I tried to define the goals of Christian education as follows:

“The aim of Christian education is to help the child experience the fullness of Christian life in the Church at all the stages of the child’s development... Christian religion is primarily a nourishment of the child’s soul — as it is at the moment when we come in touch with it. It implies the recognition of the primary importance of the individual human soul in its relationship to God at every given moment of its existence... All the basic truths of doctrine, the great realities of Church liturgical life, the moral and spiritual values of Christianity are eternal. They have a meaning and a purpose for every kind of human being, at every stage of its development...”

Religious education is not religious if it is not the vehicle of an objective contents, a something that is “greater than I” and “greater than thou.” Therefore it cannot be completely child-centered. Religious education will not be an education if the child is not an active, creative, growing, discovering participant in the process.

To experience the fullness of Christian life means far more than acquiring knowledge about it. “Knowledge of God” is not the same as “knowledge about God.” The only valid criterion of successfulness in Christian education is whether it has increased the child’s knowledge of God, that is to say whether it has brought the child nearer to God, and therefore to other in a relationship of love. All the “knowledge about God” that we may convey is merely a means to that end. And we must always clearly remember and know that the act of coming nearer to God cannot be achieved by any pedagogic trick or artifice. We cannot “make” the child know God. As Christian education we can prepare the soil, we can water it, fertilize it, we can plant the seeds, but the act of the seed’s growth will remain the mysterious, creative response of the individual soul to the creative grace of God.



## *Notes and Comments*

### **THE CHURCH IS HIERARCHAL** **An Answer to Ralph Montgomery Arkush, Esq.**

As a follow up of the storm he raised at the Tenth All American Sobor of the Russian Church by declaring that our **Church is not hierarchal**, Mr. Ralph M. Arkush has issued now a mimeographed pamphlet entitled **Is Our Church Hierarchal?** "This question — he says in conclusion — must be answered in the negative. The form of our Church is **sobornal**". This conclusion is based on: a) Webster's definition of the term "hierarchal" (ppl-2); b) a brief analysis of the various forms of church government since the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem (pp. 2-3); c) references to the Moscow Council of 1917-18 and the Detroit Sobor of 1924.

Were the conclusion of Mr. Arkush a mere 'private opinion', or rather his own peculiar interpretation of Church history, ecclesiology and canon law, we could, in spite of our total disagreement with him, pay no attention to his pamphlet. But Mr. Arkush has been for a number of years a leading layman in our Church, the official Jurisconsult of the Metropolia, the Orthodox delegate to the National Council of Churches, a lawyer, who by the very nature of his profession is constantly confronted with the meaning of Orthodox tradition. All this makes his case a very serious one. And since his views are shared by many of our lay people, those especially who play an active part in the life of the Church, we seem to face a really unprecedented situation: a segment of the Church simply refuses to accept and confess a doctrine that **has never been questioned**. One thing is made clear by this pamphlet: the time has come for an unambiguous clarification of the whole issue.

Before we come to the pamphlet, one preliminary remark of basic importance must be made. When in the "clergy-laity controversy" the terms "government", "administration", "controlling authority" are used, are all those who use them aware that when applied to the Church, they must of necessity mean something different from what they mean in a purely secular context. The Church is **not** a secular society and, therefore, all definitions and descriptions of its life and functioning to be adequate must necessarily be transposed and adjusted to its nature. Any type of government must be adequate to the nature and the purpose of what it governs. We live in a Democracy which is a high and noble doctrine of government. But we know that the principle of Democracy ("government of the people, by the people, for the people") is not applicable everywhere even in the secular society. It is not applicable to the Armed forces, to the school, to the family. Is it difficult to understand the simple and trivial truth, that for much more serious reasons it is **not applicable to the Church?** The Church is not and has never been a democracy because the Church is not a human institution with human goals and purposes. The Church is a Divine institution, founded not by men, but by Christ, receiving her life from God and having one specific goal: to save people by

introducing them into the life of grace, forgiveness, love and truth, by uniting them to the life of Christ Himself. To be sure, the Church has a human aspect, a human dimension of her life — yet this “humanity” of the Church is not independent from her spiritual essence, from her Divine root, but **embodies** it, expresses it, is totally and absolutely **subordinated** to it. To speak of two spheres in the Church — one spiritual and the other material — as being independent from one another is to completely misunderstand the real nature of the Church, whose “Pattern” is Christ Himself, God made Man, in whom the human nature was entirely **accorded** to the Divine, totally **expressive** of the Divinity. The whole Church, in all her aspects and activities, in the totality of her life is **governed** primarily by Christ, who is the Head of the Church, and this is why we must emphatically reject the very idea of a “democratic Church”, however highly we value the democratic ideal for a secular society. But, for the same reason, the idea of an “autocratic” Church is equally wrong. If in the secular context “autocratic” is the only alternative to “democratic”, this alternative simply does not apply to the Church — yet, this is precisely what Mr. Arkush and those who agree with him, are apparently unable to understand. **The Church is hierarchal** — which means, that power and authority in the Church are always related to, and proceed from, the ultimate source of its life — Christ Himself. Those who, by Divine appointment and consecration (Sacrament of Order) exercise this authority are not “autocrats” because they themselves must be totally and unconditionally subordinated to Christ and to His Church, to her Tradition, canons, to the whole of her Truth and Spirit. And the unique goal of their government is to keep the Church within this Truth and to assure her growth into the “full stature of Christ”. They “govern” the Church not by people’s consent, but by Divine appointment and the Church believes that in the Sacrament of Order they are granted necessary “charisms” or gifts for this government.

It is impossible to exclude anything in the Church from the sphere of this government, to say, for example, that the hierarchy is responsible for the “spiritual”, and the laity for the “material”, aspects of the Church life. As said above the Church has no other goal but salvation and spiritual edification of her members. All her activities, from the most spiritual to the most practical and material, are therefore internally shaped by this goal and ordered towards it. A “parish activity” that would not be in some degree related to the spiritual task of the Church would *ipso facto* be alien to the Church and to the parish, would contradict the very principle of the Church. Let us take, for example, the whole aspect of fund-raising and financial welfare of the parish, an area where the controversy on the “rights” and “responsibilities” is especially heated. Is it possible to say, as it is said so often, that this is a “material” problem and must be handled by the laity without the interference of the clergy? The very fact that money is being raised by the Church and for the Church makes this activity **spiritual**, for this money must be spent in accordance with the spiritual goal of the Church. But “it is our money” and “we don’t want any one to have control of it” is the usual answer. Another tragical misunderstanding, showing how radical is our misconception of our Church. The money that we gave to the Church has ceased to be our money and has become God’s money. It is neither ours, nor priest’s — it



belongs to the Church and the Church does not belong to us, for we belong to the Church. The possibility of **giving** to the Church is not our merit, it is the greatest privilege, it makes us coworkers in Christ's work of salvation, ministers of His purpose. Therefore the Priest who by definition is the keeper and the guide of the religious life of the Parish must necessarily give the **sanction** to every decision concerning the use of the Church's funds. The fear that he will use "our" money for "his" interests reveals the moral level of Orthodoxy in this country and is a shameful one. One of two things: either the Priest is the Priest, knowing who he is, trained to fulfill his ministry, sincere, enlightened and "pastoral" — the fear in this case is superfluous and must be replaced by trust. Or he is a bad Priest (and there have always been bad priests in the Church!) using his position to enrich himself, stealing the parish's funds, lazy, ignorant, selfish. Then he betrays his function, and the Church has all possible means to depose such a Priest and to deprive him of the function which he has betrayed and falsified. But to erect the distrust into a legal system, to establish the whole life of the Church, as if it had to be "defended" against the Priests is to make the Church a mockery and to disregard her real nature... There can be no doubt that the "controlling authority" in the Orthodox Church belongs to the hierarchy. And it should be the common goal and task of all Orthodox to assure its clergy such training and spiritual preparation that would make them capable of exercising their **authority with the wisdom, the experience and the spiritual insight** which are the characteristics of a good Pastor.

It is this misunderstanding of the **spiritual nature** of the Church (spiritual which is not opposed to, but includes, the material) that constitutes the root of the monumental distortions in Mr. Arkush's pamphlet. It is too bad Mr. Arkush does not see them. It is too bad that he is blind to the fact that his secular terminology, when applied to the Church is entirely "out of key", false, inadequate. It is the terminology and the language of someone who can see all the "legal points", and yet fails completely to see the religious essence of the Church.

The first of these errors is the opposition between "hierarchal" and "sobornal." Mr. Arkush presents these terms as mutually exclusive. "Hierarchal" means "government administered in the Church by patriarchs, archbishops, bishops etc..." (Webster) and since in our Church "the supreme legislative, administrative and judicial authority within the Church is the Sobor" with the **participation of the laity** — our Church is not "hierarchal" — so runs Mr. Arkush's argument. But it is based on a purely legal concept of the Sobor, a concept which is simply incompatible with the concept of the Church. The Sobor being the expression of the Church is itself a **hierarchal organ**, i. e. reflects and expresses the structure of the Church. All members of the Sobor take part in it **according to their order and status in the Church**: Bishops as Bishops, Priests as Priests and Laymen as Laymen. It would be absurd to think that from the moment the Sobor is convened, all its members lose their "status" in the Church and become equal "units" of an abstract government, with the majority rule as the only principle of decision.

It is obvious that the participation of the laity in the Sobor is given a false interpretation based on a false application of the "democratic" principles

to the Church. Their participation means primarily the privilege given them to express their concern for the Church, to discuss together the needs of the Church, to devise better solutions for her actual problems and to take decisions **insofar** as they are in agreement with the Tradition and the Faith of the Church. This privilege is based on the Orthodox belief that no one in the Church is deprived of the Holy Spirit, and that to every one is given the spirit of responsibility and concern for the Church, the spirit of **active membership**. It is not based, however, on any juridical right that would make laity "co-governors" and "co-administrators" of the Church. The authority to decide whether this or that decision of the Sobor is in agreement with Tradition remains with the Hierarchy and it is in this sense that the Sobor is **hierarchal**.

The Sobor is thus the expression of the common concern for the Church of all her members and the expression also of her hierarchal structure, and this is what "sobornost" and "sobornal" mean in Orthodoxy. It is a **cooperation**, in which each member of the Church is given full possibility to express his views, to enrich other with his experience, to teach and to be taught, to give and to receive. The hierarchy can profit immensely from this cooperation with the laity, just as the laity can be enlightened on the various dimensions of the Church life. But all this does not mean "egalitarianism", a transformation of hierarchy into laity and vice-versa. It is a sad fact, a tragedy indeed, that under the influence of secularism and legalism, the whole emphasis in our understanding of the Sobor activities has shifted to "decisions" and "motions" which are being considered as the main task of the Sobor, whereas its real value is in the wonderful opportunity to clarify the mind of the Church by a common discussion, by sharing the concern for the Church, by deepening the unity of all members of the Church. It is a sad fact, that instead of pervading our "secular" life with the spirit of the Church, we can think of nothing better than to transform the Church into a secular corporation with "balance of powers", "fight for rights" and pseudo-democratic "egalitarianism". Once more, the Sobor is an **hierarchal organ** of the Church, submitted as such to the basic structure of the Church and valid inasmuch only as it is **hierarchal**.

Equally wrong is Mr. Arkush's analysis of the lay participation in the Sobors of the past. In his opinion, the Church of the Ecumenical Councils not only changed the practice of the early Church (which was that of accepting the laity into the "synod") but legislated in exactly the opposite direction: laity was canonically excluded from the election of Bishops and participation in Church Councils. The "early" practice was restored by the Moscow Sobor of 1917-18, and constitutes the basis for the Church in America. First, on the election of bishops: It is true that the bishops were elected by the local church. The consecration, however, which alone made them bishops was performed by the bishops — and this order expresses the **ontological order** of the Church. Election, i. e. suggestion, proposal etc. comes from the people of the Church, the **Sanction** comes from the hierarchy, and this principle is to be applied to the whole life of the Church, in which, according to St. Ignatius of Antioch "nothing can be done without the bishop" (i. e. without the hierarchal sanction). No canon ever condemned or forbade the election of the bishop

by the people and if this was not done for a long time, the reason is purely historical and accidental, not "canonical." It is highly desirable to restore it wherever and whenever possible, but let it be clear, that **election** as such is not the condition of validity for a bishop. The Apostles were not "elected" by anyone, and it is at least doubtful that St. Paul when appointing Timothee or Titus was basing his choice on a popular election. It is true that many forms and the very spirit of secular government pervaded the Church after her alliance with the Roman Empire, transforming the bishops into high officials (hence — the uncanonical transfers of bishops, the idea of a "cursus honorum", the weakening of the ties between the bishop and his church etc.) but it is also true that the best bishops and the real canonical tradition were always fighting this transformation as a distortion and called for the restoration of a true Orthodox ecclesiology.

"The canons of the Ecumenical Councils — writes Mr. Arkush — make no mention of the laity as sharing in Church government. On the contrary they indicate that the Bishop solely governed the Church". I am glad that Mr. Arkush makes this clear statement and, although he tries immediately to question its relevance for us and our time, there remains the fact that our Church knows of no other canonical tradition but precisely that of the Ecumenical Councils period. The Church was **governed** by the Bishops because the Bishops **are** the ministers of Church government, and to ask whether this principle or "canon" is still binding is to ask whether the Church is still the Church. What Mr. Arkush overlooks, however, is the fact that the **lay participation** in shaping the life and the activities of the Church, its **voice** — was fully recognized, even though they took no official part in the Church councils. The great monastic movement was at its beginning a lay movement, yet it had a great impact on the whole life of the Church. Eusebius of Dorylea was a simple layman when he protested against the heretical teaching of his bishop Nestorius. Theologians were not necessarily bishops and the tradition of "lay theology" has remained a living one even to-day. Participation, activity, concern for the Church, thinking, discussion — all this was never denied to the laity, on the contrary, belongs to it as its right and duty.

It was indeed a wonderful achievement of the Moscow Sobor of 1917-18 that it restored this **lay participation** to its full capacity and gave the laity new possibilities of cooperation with the hierarchy and creative activity in the Church, and this at a moment when the common defense of the Church became an urgent need. It brought to an end a false "clericalism", a situation in which clergy alone constitute the active element in the Church. It clearly proclaimed the principle that all Christians are living and active members of the Church. But the Moscow Sobor **did not and could not** change the basic structure of the Church, as Mr. Arkush seems to interpret its decisions. By introducing the laity into the Sobor — "the supreme authority of the Church", it did not change the status of the laity in the Church, it did not give them "rights of government". The final sanction within the Sobor belongs to the Bishops, and this principle according to Prof. Kartashoff was the "corner stone of the whole activity of the Sobor" (A Kartashoff. **The Revolution and the Sobor of 1917-18**, in "The Theological Thought", Paris



1942, pp. 88) — "All decisions of the plenary sessions — writes Prof. Kar-tashoff — were revised at special sessions of the Bishop's Council; if rejected by three-fourths of the Episcopate, they were sent back to the plenary session. If not accepted by the Bishops after revisions by the Sobor, they were not to become official acts of the Sobor". Thus, at this point Mr. Arkush's inter-pretation is false. The Sobor created two organs of the Church government: the Synod of Bishops and the Supreme Church Council, and it was clearly stated that to the competence of the Synod of Bishops belong the questions concerning Doctrine, Worship, Theological Education, **Ecclesiastical Govern-ment and Discipline** (Decision of December '8, 1917). Finally, in the Parish statute (April 20, 1918) the government of the parish is defined as follows: "it is the duty of the Rector to have a concern for all the activities of the Parish" (Ch. V. 29). To oppose the Moscow Sobor to the earlier tradition of the Church, to see in it the beginning of a "sobornal as opposed to the hierar-chal Church" is therefore a pure distortion.

Mr. Arkush's pamphlet has one notorious merit: it crystallizes the issue of our present ecclesiastical trouble. He formulates the question and answers it in the negative. It is our absolute conviction that the Orthodox faith and the Orthodox tradition put us under obligation to answer it in the positive. **The Church is hierarchal.** To let these two mutually exclusive answers co-exist any longer would endanger the very foundation of Orthodoxy in this country. All men, who put the Church, her Life and her Truth, above their own private and individual options, likes and dislikes, must understand the ultimate scope of this controversy, make their choice and act accordingly.

Alexander Schmemmann.



## ORTHODOXY AND MISSION

### Syndesmos' Executive Committee on Orthodox Missions

To recover the missionary dimension of the Church is today's greatest imperative. We have to recover a very basic truth: that the Church is **es-sentially Mission**, that the very roots of her life are in the commandment of Christ: "Go Ye therefore and teach all nations" (Matt. 28:19). A Christian community that would lose this missionary zeal and purpose, that would become selfish and self-centered, that would limit itself to "satisfying the spiritual needs of its members", that would identify itself completely with a nation, a society, a social or ethnic group — is on its way to spiritual deca-dence and death, because the essential spiritual need of a Christian is pre-cisely that of sharing the life and the Truth with as many men as possible and ultimately with the whole world. Mission thus is the organic need and task of the Church in the world, the real **meaning** of Church's presence in history between the first and the second advents of her Lord, or, in other terms, the meaning of Christian history. Obviously not all members of the Church can go and preach in the literal sense of the word. But all can have a concern for the missionary function of the Church, feel responsible for it, help and

support it. In this respect each diocese, each parish and each member of the Church are involved in the missionary ministry.

Thanks to God there are many signs of a revival of missionary spirit among the Orthodox. One of the most encouraging, the most inspiring ones is the creation by Syndesmos of an **Executive Committee on Orthodox Missions**, with headquarters in Athens. Under the efficient guidance of its General Secretary, Mr. Anastasios Yanoulatos, it has established a plan for a great missionary movement within the Orthodox world. It publishes a bulletin "**Poreuthentes**" (**Go Ye**), which besides an excellent survey of the different missionary undertakings, works at the clarification of the theological and spiritual presuppositions of the Orthodox mission.

The October-December, 1959, issue of **Preuthentes** (N. 4) contains an Editorial by Fr. John Meyendorff, President of Syndesmos. "...The era in which we live — writes Fr. Meyendorff — appears as extremely favorable for the Orthodox mission. The peoples of Asia and Africa in attaining political independence often regard with suspicion the mighty western mission whose expansion has coincided with the progress of "colonialism". The past of the Orthodox Church, if only she were really present in the mission field, would guarantee her against all suspicion of this kind... Perhaps this is the "hour of the Lord" at which the Christian gospel will be heard in its Orthodox fulness by all the nations of the earth".

A **Program of Work and Perspectives** signed by Mr. Yanoulatos describes, in a very clear form, the practical aims and the methods of the Committee.

"As it is known — writes Mr. Yanoulatos — the problem of external missions not only has not been carefully studied by our Church, during our time, but hardly interests the great number of Orthodox people at all..." The program includes therefore

- a) a systematic study of the Orthodox mission in its historical development.
- b) the development of a missionary interest among the Orthodox (by means of publications, lectures, youth groups, exhibits etc.)
- c) creation of stronger links with the young Orthodox Churches in Uganda, Korea and Japan.

A "Missionary Center" is projected in Athens...

The Bulletin has also an important section entitled "Orthodoxy over the World" and a Review of the History of Missions.

Alexander Schmemmann.



## *Book Reviews*

Alexander Bogolepov, **THE CHURCH UNDER COMMUNIST RULE** (in Russian), Munich Institute for the Study of the USSR, 202 pp.

With an important part of this very important volume the readers of **THE ST. VLADIMIR'S SEMINARY QUARTERLY** are already familiar; they certainly remember Professor Bogolepov's article on "The Statutes of the Russian Orthodox Church of 1945" published in the Summer, 1958, issue of the Quarterly. Now this article finds its place in a systematic study of **THE CHURCH UNDER COMMUNIST RULE**.

The volume consists of two parts. The first is devoted to the legal status of the Russian Church and its relationship to the Communist State and different religious bodies. The early sections contain an historical survey of the religious policy of the Soviet government up to the Moscow Sobor of 1945. Then come the sections covered by the article aforementioned. The treatment of the subject is centered around a real discovery made by the author. Professor Bogolepov convincingly shows that several clauses of the Statutes of 1945 which at first glance appear harmless, deliver to the atheist government the keys to the personal composition of the hierarchy. These clauses deal with the "registration of the seals" of each individual clergyman, beginning with the humblest parish priest and finishing with the Patriarch himself. Without registration, nobody is entitled to perform any function in the Church. The registration depends on "appropriate civil authorities", i. e. officials of the Council on the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church. It is obvious that he who has the power to register has also power to deny the registration. This power is discretionary; consequently, the appointment of a parish priest, the designation of a bishop to rule a certain diocese, even the election of the Patriarch **must** be preceded by an agreement between some members of the Church and the appropriate authorities. In other words, although the government has not ascribed itself the right of appointing the Church personnel, it has, **according to the Statutes**, the right to eliminate any candidate whose loyalty to the regime might be questioned. Of course, the dependency of the Russian Church on the government was well known to the students of Russian Church affairs; but, to the knowledge of the present reviewer, nobody found out what was the subtle mechanism making this dependency legal.

The first part continues by discussing the relationship of the Moscow Patriarchate and the Soviet government, the other religious bodies in the USSR, the other Orthodox Churches and, finally, the Catholic and Protestant Churches outside the USSR. To conclude, the author outlines the attitudes of the hierarchy of the Russian Church toward the Soviet regime and underlines that the present day attitudes resemble those of the Living Church, the opposition to which was one of the main preoccupations of Patriarch Tikhon and of Metropolitan Sergius during the earlier years of his rule.

The second part begins with a general statement on the religious (or,



perhaps, antireligious?) policy of the so-called People's democracies. The final ends of this policy have been the same as those of the Russian Communists. But the new rulers of the satellites have profited from the experience of the Russian Communists with the policy of "direct action" and have accordingly chosen the patterns which have been characteristic of "the new religious policy" in the USSR. In some satellites, local conditions have demanded some modifications. Consequently, the institutions vary from satellite to satellite. In Professor Bogolepov's book one finds concise, but rather complete statements on the Church State relations in Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Among the departures from the Soviet model these deserve special attention. In Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary children may receive, at school, religious education at the request of the parents; but this education must be conducted by persons and according to programs approved by the government. In Rumania and Bulgaria small portions of Church property have been exempted from nationalization. In all the five satellites surveyed the government pays salaries to the clergymen and grants some money to the Church administration; the significance of this measure is rather ambivalent since he who holds the strings of the purse necessarily exerts influence on those who get the money.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that the Christians of the satellite never had to pass through the ordeal of persecution like the one in Russia from 1922 to 1939. Through their stubborn adherence to the Church, says the author, the Russian Christians have prepared a somewhat lighter way to their progeny and to the citizens of the People's democracies. Here one discovers the historical significance of the repeal, the by the Russian believers, of the "attack on heaven" carried out by the Russian Communists.

Professor Bogolepov's book is entirely based on reliable sources, such as legislative texts, publications of the Churches surveyed, statements of eye-witnesses and participants in the struggle. It is very well organized, concise, sober in evaluation and cautious as to prognoses. For all those who are interested in the state of religion behind the Iron Curtain and know Russian, this is a "must" book.

N. S. Timasheff



Jean Meyendorff — "Introduction a l'etude de Gregoire Palamas". Editions du Seuil, Paris. 1959. — 431 pp.

——— "St. Grégoire Palamas et la mystique orthodoxe" Editions du Seuil, Paris 1959. — 189 pp.

This year Orthodox literature was enriched by four books concerning the life and theology of St. Gregory Palamas. We owe this to the young Orthodox scholar, Father John Meyendorff, who studied and later became lecturer at St. Sergius Theological Institute and obtained his doctorate at the Sorbonne University in Paris. This September he began teaching at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary in New York City.

We have mentioned above the titles of two of these books. Two other books by Father John include the edition and the translation into French

of one of the main works of St. Gregory. The French title of the translation is "Defense des Saints Hesychastes" (published by Louvain University). Of 72 works of St. Gregory only 34 have been published, of these 5 have not been published since the 18th century. Ten were published for the first time by Rev. Meyendorff. Thirty-eight (38) are still unpublished. There are very few translations of St. Gregory's books into modern languages. Therefore, Fr. Meyendorff deserves gratitude as the publisher and translator of this great theologian.

Let us now return to the books written by Fr. John himself. The first book consists of 1) a short introduction, 2) a bibliography in which are mentioned more than 150 books and articles, (the majority of these are concerned not with St. Gregory himself, but with his epoch and the theological problems connected with Palamism; there are few books about St. Gregory and his theology), 3) a biography of St. Gregory (149 pp.), 4) an outline of his theology (158 pp.), 5) a description of all the works of St. Gregory, both published and unpublished, 6) a list of the medieval Greek sources used by Rev. Meyendorff, (141 items of which 70 are manuscripts).

Even the simple description of the content of Fr. Meyendorff's book shows its great scholarly value. Undoubtedly anyone studying St. Gregory Palamas in the future will make use of this book.

The biography of St. Gregory is written with an exceptionally scholarly objectivity, but those who shall read this biography will certainly be convinced in the genuine holiness of St. Gregory and of the sincerity of his struggle for Orthodoxy.

Fr. Meyendorff presents the theology of St. Gregory in the following scheme: St. Gregory recognizes an essential difference between the possibility of communion with God and of His knowledge given to all men and that given particularly to Christians as members of Christ. The reality of communion with God and His contemplation is proved by the experience of Christian saints and especially by monastic mysticism. The holy Father is first concerned with the defense and explanation of the hesychast school of monastic spirituality... The foundation of the Christian relation with God is the Incarnation: divinity and humanity are united in Jesus Christ and we participate in Christ through the sacraments and the efforts of our lives. Outside of Christ our relation with God is inevitably of a theoretical or symbolical character, but in Christ both the spirit and body of man are united with God. Nevertheless, following the patristic tradition, St. Gregory does not recognize the possibility for even saints to be united with the very essence of God or to know it. God in Himself is transcendent to man. Communion with God is possible only because God reveals Himself in His divine energies, descending from His absolute form of existence to us.

The ideas of God and His energies are the principles of divine activity in the world and the church. In the light of this doctrine St. Gregory explains the creation of the world by God, the divine revelation, the incarnation, divine grace and the possibility of divinization (theosis) of Christians in the Church.

Rev. Meyendorff concludes his analysis with a short explanation of the doctrine of St. Gregory about the Holy Spirit and the Mother of God.

The author speaks briefly of the relation of Palamism to Western



theology. However, he gives a detailed description of the connection of St. Gregory with Byzantine theology of the XIIIth and XIVth centuries.

The second book of Rev. Meyendorff is written with great erudition but with appeal to the general public. The first part (69pp) is consecrated to the theology of spiritual life from the Old Testament to the XIVth century A. D. The second part (160pp) concerns St. Gregory Palamas and his theology. The third (40 pp) speaks about monasticism of the hesychast school after St. Gregory. The book is small, but richly illustrated.

St. Gregory Palamas was the last great theologian of Byzantium, but his teaching has a permanent importance for Orthodox theology. We must be grateful to Fr. Meyendorff for enabling us to know better the great Doctor of the church. Palamism is an essential part of Orthodox theology, because it gives the best explanation of the teaching of the Holy Scripture and tradition about the relations of God with the world and the Church.

I hope that the dogmatical and historical problems raised in the books of Fr. Meyendorff will be the subject of further discussion.

Serge Verkhovsky.



**Joseph Glazik, DIE RUSSISCH-ORTHODOXE HEIDENMISSION SEIT PETER DEM GROSSEN.** Ein missionsgeschichtlicher Versuch nach russischen Quellen und Darstellungen (Missionswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen und Texte, 19) Muenster, 1954.

———, **DIE ISLAMMISSION DER RUSSISCH-ORTHODOXEN KIRCHE.** — Eine Missionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung nach russischen Quellen und Darstellungen mit vier Uebersichtskarten (Missionswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen und Texte, 23) Muenster, 1959.)

The Western world knows very little about Orthodox missions sponsored by the Church of Russia. Its information comes generally from the two brief english essays by Smirnoff and Bolshakoff, published respectively in 1903 and 1943. The monumental works of Joseph Glazik is thus filling a real gap in the Western literature on the Orthodox Church. The author uses extensively a very rich amount of Russian material on missions, analysing every aspect of Russian missionary activity in Eastern Europe, Asia and America in 18th, 19th and 20th centuries, providing statistic and maps.

The second book, devoted to the missions among Moslems, is particularly interesting since this type of mission has never been very successful when in the hands of the Western christians. The succes of the Orthodox mission is thus providing a real contrast. The mission of the Church being nowadays on the agenda of many ecumenical meetings and conferences, we hope that J. Glazik's books will receive the wide circulation they deserve. Irresponsible satements about the non-missionary character of Eastern Christianity is too often a source of misunderstanding and confusion. An English translation of these books would be highly desirable.

John Meyendorff



**D. J. Geanakoplos, EMPEROR MICHAEL PALAEOLOGUS AND THE WEST (1258-1282). A Study in Byzantine-Latin relations, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1959, pp. 434.**

Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologus is certainly one of the prominent political figures of the late Byzantine period. A national hero, he delivered Constantinople from the Latin yoke and succeeded in restoring the Empire for almost two centuries. But, at the same time, his tragic political machiavellism led him to accept the Union of Lyons and to impose it by force on the Orthodox majority of his subjects. Professor Geanakoplos has produced a good piece of work on Michael's paradoxal personality: his foreign policy and his epic political and military fights with Charles of Anjou are examined in detail, as well as the history of the Union of Lyons. One wonders however if a greater attention to the inner problems of Byzantium — the social situation, the Arsenite schism, the problem of Church-State relations — would not have given a more accurate picture of Michael's relations with the West. The Emperor's cesaropapistic attitude in dealing with Church union was something very peculiar to him: Byzantine emperors have never adopted such an attitude since the time of Iconoclasm. This was worth noting especially since several of his successors did imitate him in this respect and the Popes committed the heavy mistake of believing in Byzantine cesaropapism and of trying to use it for their own purposes. This general remark does not diminish whatsoever the great value of the remarkable amount of genuine information given in the book.

**John Meyendorff**

**Joseph Gill, S. J. THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, University Press, 1959, XVIII 453 pp.**

The publication of this valuable book on the Council of Florence appears as very timely in these days, when the Roman Church is preparing another Council also dealing with the question of unity. A Professor at the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome, the author was working for some time on this historical survey of Florence and he is certainly nowadays one of the most competent scholars in the field which was largely cleaned by the work and publications of another prominent Jesuit scholar, the late Fr. Hofmann, initiator of the series *Concilium Florentinum*.

On the basis of the three main sources on the Council (the Greek Acts, the Latin Acts and the Memoirs of Syropoulos), Fr. Gill gives a historical synthesis of everything we know on the preparation, the sessions and the consequences of the Council. A particular emphasis is rightly given to its Western political and ecclesiastical background, i. e. the Great Schism, the Councils of Constance and of Basel and the whole conciliar movement, trying to promote the authority of Ecumenical Councils as superior to that of the Pope. The very poor use made by the Greeks of these circumstances, apparently favourable to their ecclesiological position, is one of the major paradoxes of Florence. The failure of the negotiations between Constantinople and Basel, and the final support given by the Byzantines to the papal claims had in practice more results in the West itself than in the field of union between East and West: "the Council secured the victory for the popes

in the struggle of papacy versus council" (p. 411), thus suppressing the ground for a peaceful reformation of the Western Church, and "embittered the division" with the East (*ibid*). A century later, the claim for a Reformation will come in a more radical form and the Eastern Orthodox tradition will be completely absent from the scene... So the Council of Florence appears, in its apparent and brief success and in its shortcomings, as having been a tremendous opportunity for a real encounter of East and West, and in particular, an opportunity for the Orthodox Church to play a role in the inner struggles of the West: political pressures, mutual ignorance and a total lack of common theological language were the reasons why this opportunity was lost.

Although written from the Roman point of view, Fr. Gill's book is dealing with facts with a remarkable objectivity and must find a place in every theological library.

**John Meyendorff**



### **Archbishop Iakovos visits the Seminary**

On Tuesday, December 15, His Eminence the Most Reverend Archbishop Iakovos, Head of the Greek Archdiocese in the Americas and the Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarch, visited St. Vladimir's Seminary. He was accompanied by the Very Rev. Kazanas, Dean of the Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral in New York.

His Eminence arrived at the Seminary at 10:30 A. M., and was met by the Rev. Alexander Schmemmann, Vice Dean, and members of the Faculty. There was a short Te Deum service in the Seminary Chapel sung by Father Schmemmann and the Student's Choir. After the service, Archbishop Iakovos addressed the students and the Faculty.

The Exarch stressed the importance of Orthodox theological education in this country and praised highly the scholastic and spiritual achievements of the Seminary accomplished in spite of material difficulties. He also emphasized the need for closer cooperation between various Orthodox jurisdictions in America, particularly in the vital field of theological education.

Fr. A. Schmemmann thanked His Eminence for his gracious visit and inspiring address. He expressed the joy of all members of the Seminary to see among them the distinguished Orthodox Church leader and the representative of the first among Orthodox Patriarchs.

All students received a blessing from the Archbishop.

There followed a tea in the common room at which members of the Faculty were introduced to His Eminence. Professor Nicholas Arsenieff, the oldest member of the Faculty, greeted the Archbishop on behalf of the Faculty. The Very Rev. Alexis Yonoff, Dean of New York District, extended greetings to the Exarch from Metropolitan Leonty, President and Dean of the Seminary, who was unable to be present.

